The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS FEB 14 1915 PERIODICAL

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 6
No. 4

FEBRUARY
1915

THE WORKING ALLIANCE—SUFFRAGE AND SOCIALISM

A FATAL FLAW IN THE "EQUALITY" ARGUMENT

THE DEBATE IN THE HOUSE ON SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT

"TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION" MISAPPLIED BY SUFFRAGISTS

REFORM DUE TO PUBLIC OPINION

JUDGE GRAY'S OPPOSITION

THE EBBING OF THE SUFFRAGE TIDE

THE EVIL OF MINORITY LEGISLATION

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1913, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.

Vice-Presidents, Miss Mary S. Ames, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.; Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha, Neb.; Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland, Me.

Secretary, Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield, Conn.

Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.

General Sec'y, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. James M. Codman, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. Augustus Gardner, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton, O.
Mrs. A. F. Jamieson, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Miss Jane U. Rutherfoord, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. H. F. Lyster, Detroit, Mich.
Mrs. Clarence Morgan, Burlington, Vt.
Miss C. W. Patterson, Macon, Ga.
Mrs. J. Gilfillan, Minneapolis, Minn.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Elizabeth Burnell, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover, Mrs. Wm. B. Williams.
Treasurer, Mrs. Albert S. Cooke.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Walter S. Schulz, Hartford.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Wm. T. Howe, 41 Lorraine Street, Hartford.

DELAWARE

Organization Committee, Wilmington
Chairman, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. David A. Reinhardt.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupont, Jr.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Richard Cuyler King, Mrs. N. K. Troutman, Mrs. J. E. Peacock, Miss Mildred Rutherford.
Secretary, Mrs. B. F. Sutton.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. S. C. Moore, Macon.
Treasurer, Mrs. Flewellen Holt.
Chairman Press Committee, Mrs. Walter D. Lamar.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. Robert J. Taylor.

IOWA COMMITTEE

President, Mrs. Martin Flynn.
Secretary, Mrs. Simon Casady, 715 Prospect Road, Des Moines.

MARYLAND

Office: Garrett Building, German and South Streets, Baltimore.
President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Mrs. John Halsup Adams, Mrs. Arthur B. Kinsolving, Mrs. Michael Wild.
Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles B. Penrose.

MAINE

President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Philip W. McIntyre, Mrs. David W. Snow.
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler.
Secretary, Mrs. George S. Hobbs, 48 Neal Street, Portland.

MASSACHUSETTS

Office: 687 Boylston Street, Boston, Room 615.
President, Mrs. James M. Codman.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Mary S. Ames, Mrs. George R. Agassiz, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Robert S. Russell.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman.
Recording Secretary, Miss Ellen Tower.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Boston.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. L. E. Clark, Mrs. C. A. Kent, Mrs. Charles W. Casgrain, Mrs. Joseph B. Schlotman.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William S. Jerome.

MINNESOTA

President, Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Walter Richardson, St. Paul; Mrs. Alfred Pillsbury, Minneapolis; Mrs. Edmund Pennington, Minneapolis; Mrs. E. C. Stringer, St. Paul.
Honorary President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. Daniel R. Noyes, St. Paul.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. W. W. Sykes, Minneapolis.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. L. Stevens, St. Paul.
General Secretary, Miss Rita Kelley, 331 Meyers Arcade, Minneapolis.
Executive Committee, Minneapolis, Mrs. J. S. Bell, Mrs. G. H. Christian, Mrs. H. C. Clarke, Mrs. H. Harcourt Horn, Mrs. L. K. Hull, Mrs. C. J. Martin, Mrs. J. H. MacMillan, Mrs. J. R. Marfield, Mrs. O. C. Wyman, Mrs. John Washburn, Mrs. C. C. Webber; St. Paul, Mrs. D. F. De Wolf, Miss Mary Davis, Miss Caroline Fairchild, Mrs. Emerson Hadley, Mrs. A. H. Lindeke, Mrs. J. E. Ricketts, Mrs. C. L. Spencer, Mrs. F. F. Wright.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord; Mrs. Thomas C. Bethune, Concord; Mrs. Will B. Howe, Concord; Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Portsmouth; Mrs. John R. Spring, Nashua.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carry R. Todd.

NEBRASKA

President, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck.
Executive Committee, Mrs. Henry W. Yates, Mrs. John C. Cowin, Mrs. J. W. Griffith, Mrs. W. H. Koenig, Mrs. L. F. Crofoot, Mrs. Gerrit Fort, Mrs. John L. Webster, Mrs. Helen Arion Lewis, Mrs. Arthur Crittenden Smith, Mrs. T. J. Mackay, Mrs. F. N. Conner, Miss Janet M. Wallace.
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street, Omaha.
Treasurer, Mrs. Frank J. Hoel, 110 South 34th Street.
Mrs. J. W. Crumpacker, Special Representative National Association, 536 Bee Building, Omaha.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.
Honorary President, Miss Dayton.
President, Mrs. A. F. Jamieson.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr., Mrs. Cornelius Hook, Mrs. Thomas Craven, Mrs. Garret A. Hobart, Mrs. John R. Emery, Mrs. William J. Libbey, Miss H. O. Magie, Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Miss Clara Vezin, Mrs. Karl G. Roebling, Mrs. William S. Stryker.
Treasurer, Mrs. George B. Yarde.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. R. C. Maxwell.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. A. E. Pendergast.
General Secretary, Mrs. Orville D. Oliphant.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 35 West 39th Street, New York.
President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Eleanor G. Hewitt, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. George Douglas Miller, Mrs. William P. Northrup.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Secretary, Mrs. M. E. Loomis.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. C. N. Frick, Mrs. J. G. Gundersen, Mrs. E. B. Goss, Mrs. C. E. Wolf, Mrs. T. L. Beiseker, Mrs. L. B. Dochterman, Mrs. H. C. Chaffee, Mrs. R. H. Bosard, Miss M. O. Moyine, Mrs. J. W. Reynolds.
Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell, Fargo.
Executive Committee, Mrs. N. C. Young, Mrs. W. J. Howe, Mrs. D. B. Holt.

OHIO

President, Mrs. Harry E. Talbott, Dayton.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman, Cincinnati; Mrs. Frank D. Jamison, Cincinnati; Mrs. Joseph A. Jeffrey, Columbus; Mrs. J. H. J. Upham, Columbus; Mrs. John Bradley Greene, Dayton; Mrs. Harry G. Carnell, Dayton; Mrs. Helen M. Lucas, Marietta; Mrs. J. Herbert Roach, Cleveland; Mrs. Charles Orr, Cleveland; Mrs. Milton James, Austin; Mrs. Cyrus Newby, Hillsboro; Miss Alice Bennett, Chillicothe.
Field Secretaries, Miss Lucy Price, Cleveland; Miss Clara Markeson, Columbus; Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Cincinnati.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. MacMillan, 9 Dartmouth Drive, Dayton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 261 South Fifteenth Street, Philadelphia.
President, Mrs. Horace Brock.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Miss Grace Falkner, Miss Sophy Dallas Irwin, Mrs. James Large, Mrs. John Markoe, Miss Mary Newhall.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Louise C. Hoppin, Mrs. Howard O. Sturges, Mrs. Stephen O. Metcalf.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard. Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. Clarence Morgan.
Vice-President, Mrs. George W. Wales.
Secretary, Mrs. M. H. Buckham, Burlington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Clarence Morgan.
Executive Committee, Mrs. G. G. Benedict, Mrs. Addison B. Buell, Mrs. Merritt D. Chittenden, Miss Bertha Terrill.

VIRGINIA

President, Miss Jane U. Rutherfoord.
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. William F. Gray.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Hunsdom Cary, Mrs. Arthur P. Wilmer, Miss Annie Rose Walker, Mrs. James Lyons.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell, 1714 Grove Avenue, Richmond.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

1402 H Street, N. W.
President, Mrs. Augustus P. Gardner.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. John W. Weeks, Mrs. Douglas P. Birnie.
Recording Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Davis.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Esther Denny.
Treasurer, Miss Alice Card.
Executive Committee, Mrs. William W. Mathewson, Mrs. Frederick Keep, Mrs. E. Rollins Morse, Mrs. Swager Sherley, Miss Josephine Patten, Mrs. William Cogswell, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard.

WISCONSIN

President, Miss Mary L. Atwood.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Geo. H. Noyes.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. Frank L. Vance.
Secretary, Miss Gertrude S. Bean, 4 Prospect Avenue, Milwaukee.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ellis B. Usher.

THE WORKING ALLIANCE—SUFFRAGE AND SOCIALISM

AT the January meeting of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, the President, emphasized the allegiance of Feminism, Socialism and Mormonism with woman suffrage. She said:

"All Feminists, Socialists and Mormons are in favor of woman suffrage and doing what they can to further it, knowing that at the same time they are advancing their "isms." Evidence has been piling up indicating unmistakably the Socialist support of woman suffrage. The leaders of the suffrage movement cannot and will not deny it, nor have they ever repudiated it. The Socialists, carrying their banners, have taken part in all the big woman suffrage parades and they have been welcomed. At the recent convention of the National Woman Suffrage Association, in Nashville, Tenn., the Socialists of that city filed into the auditorium in which the Sunday session was held and proudly rested their banners against the walls. They remained as guests of these woman suffrage agitators throughout the meeting.

"Socialism is rampant in woman suffrage States, and the Socialist vote was responsible for establishing the "cause" in several of those States. In Nevada, after the recent election, woman Suffragists thanked the Socialists for assistance, and the statement was proudly made that every Socialist vote had been cast for woman suffrage.

"We are not attacking such Socialism as stands for the brotherhood of man and the moral and financial assistance of the needy. That's not the kind of Socialism that's behind woman suffrage. It is Socialism such as the American Republic repudiates and is trying to hold in check. It is the Socialism that would destroy individual enterprise and take over all business under State or governmental supervision and make this nation an oligarchy. Then would the poor man, the man of ability and of ambition be at the mercy of the political party in power for a job. Initiative would be destroyed and the unfit, whose chief pretense to recognition would be ability to deliver the vote on election day, would fill the places in business and utility enterprises such as men of to-day acquire through experience, fitness and competition.

"Do the business men and the workingmen realize the alliance between woman suffrage and Socialism? Tell them that the Socialist vote would be nearly doubled through the extension of the ballot to women, and they will awake and arise with their might to stay the sinister influences that are trying to advance themselves on this silly propaganda."

A FATAL FLAW IN THE "EQUALITY" ARGUMENT

By Marjorie Dorman

"EQUALITY" is a meaningless term. Nature has been busy for aeons in evolving inequalities, *i. e.*, differences.

Men might, with some neglect of their present occupations, learn to do that branch of the world's work toward which women are now specialized, acquiring the patience, the sympathy, the sensitive watchfulness necessary with children. Women might take time from this same patience, and attention from this same watchfulness, to learn the way of governing, to substitute compromise for the uncompromising high sandards, which at present, from outside the ring, they urge upon the fighters and teach to their sons; to substitute for sympathy and repeated patience with failure the amazonian strength necessary to enforce any law, in which they were opposed to a majority of men—that is, they might—if there were any race left by that time for them to govern, a matter at least open to question.

Why is it not wise to undertake this reversal of rôles? Simply because we should then have wasted hundreds of centuries of specialization, during which, badly as each sex does its work, yet each has learned to do it better than the other could do it.

I will not go into the question of the unfitness of the nervous systems of women to bear any added strain of responsibility or excitement. This is the province of the biologists and they have sounded the warning clearly enough, that nature intends the mother to be a conserver of force, not a spender.

Though the spheres of the two sexes are differentiated, they have much in common. We are all human beings. As the woman has her home duties, so the man has his business. Why is not politics a middle ground to which each should devote some time for the sake of the State?

First because the time that a woman would have to spend in this way to be an intelligent voter is out of all proportion to the time a man need spend. We will compare the average, leaving aside the Suffragist absurdities, that the "lady is more intelligent than her coachman," or that "some men don't vote intelligently." Most political questions are concerned with matters with which a man in his business comes in daily contact, fiscal and commercial problems, transportation, etc. He discusses these things daily with other men and has some basis of opinion on them. Women, on the other hand, are, by their "business"—the home—cut off during working hours from these very subjects, and cut off, too, from general discussion from the fact that women's work cannot be done in the aggregate as men's is done "down-town," but must be accomplished by each in her separate dwelling. Business and politics are communal, the home is individual. This is especially true of the wife of the poor man. We may leave out of account the handful of women who have neither home nor business duties, whose wealth gives them prominence but not importance.

There is a fashion lately of considering the exceptions, the offshoots from the line of life, as more important than the main line, and this needs analysis and contradiction. Mothers alone are *vital* to the race. The unmarried woman is a side issue. The married wage-earning woman in an anomaly, an exception, even though, owing to our imperfect economic system, there are a good many such, especially in the congested centres, where the labor market for men is over-supplied. The self-supporting woman, married or single, is the ward of the community, to be protected in her abnormal position, but no possible advantage to her could compensate the race or the State for an added burden upon the home-making woman. (The question of *how*, if she were the first consideration in this matter, the wage-earning woman could be benefited by having a vote is another matter.) We need to be reminded, in this age of interest in exceptions, that, after all, splendid as has been the public work of some unusual women, the world could have spared it, men could have done it. The world cannot spare even the average mother. And if every mother did her share the exceptional women would have far less to do than now appears.

The vast majority of wage-earning women, however, after a short independence, become wives and mothers, their interests then becoming those of the consumer rather than the wage-earner, so that even if political power could help the wage-earning woman as a class, where any conflict of interest arose she would be ever, one may say, turning against herself. And this is a vital difference between the wage-earning woman and the wage-earning man.

I emphasize this becausé the appeal—"The ballot to help the working woman"—fallacious as it is, moves the unthinking more than a hundred arguments.

The Woman's Protest
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by
The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City.
President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover.....Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.

Vol. VI. February, 1915 No. 4

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

THE VOTE IN THE HOUSE

THE Bristow-Mondell resolution was reported and voted upon in the National House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 12, 1915. This joint resolution proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women and read as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"Article —. Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Sec. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

The discussion lasted for eight hours. It is impossible to give in full any of the speeches in opposition, and as the PROTEST is limited in space it is able to quote only extracts from some of the speeches of those who defended our cause. The final vote of 204 nays against 174 yeas is impressive, particularly when we remember that a fortnight before the prohibition amendment won a majority vote, a two-thirds vote being necessary for passage. More than thirty-five per cent. of the vote for suffrage came from suffrage States.

The press of the country very generally accepted the view of the PROTEST, that the suffrage forces had made this endeavor to call a vote in the House of Representatives for the purposes of publicity. We reprint two editorials which summarize popular opinion on the verdict of the vote of January 12th.

(*Editorial from N. Y. Times, Jan.* 13, 1915.)

The debate on the proposal to submit to the States an amendment to the Federal Constitution conferring the right of suffrage on women, which occupied all the time of the House of Representatives yesterday and will impose upon the people an enormous printer's bill, as all the speeches in the debate will be printed in full for distribution throughout the country, may have been, as Mr. Underwood said, a consideration of a grave question, but the gravity of the occasion was not noticeable. It may be, as Mr. Webb declared, that 80 per cent. of the women of the country would vote against the question if it were submitted to them, but the question, grave or not, was not the matter actually in hand. Nobody for a moment expected the measure to receive the necessary two-thirds majority. Members who joined in the main debate on either side did so for the effect their words would have on local constituencies. Like the debate on Hobson's prohibition amendment, it was all a sheer and premeditated waste of time. Congress has more work than it can hope to do well before the end of the short session. In the circumstances, to devote a whole day to solemn haranguing over a subject which is of no national importance at all, as such an amendment to the Constitution, if ever submitted, would be voted down even in woman suffrage States, was worse than folly.

The result was better than could have been expected. There was not even a majority for the amendment. The votes for woman suffrage, including many cast in its favor which were so cast only because the members knew that the measure must fail, lacked seventy-eight of the necessary two-thirds, and there were fifty-seven absentees, who doubtless found more profitable ways of spending the day than in idle debate.

As the women's "day in court" at the Capitol, the occasion, perhaps, was of some small historic note. The Suffragists have been trying many years to get some show of national approval of their movement, and though they could scarcely have missed the longed-for triumph by a larger margin in an era when, as Mr. Mann so fluently expressed it, "the tendency of the world everywhere is toward enlarging the grant of power to those who shall control the destinies of the race" (the exact meaning of which can doubtless be learned on application to the proper source), yet they had an enjoyable and inspiriting time. Femininity was assuredly dominant. Whether the women present were Suffragists who approve Mr. Mondell's plan to overturn our fundamental law and the theory of the Democratic Party that each State shall govern its own franchise; or those of another mind who believe in confining the fight to the States, or out-and-out Antis, it was their very own day. They crowded the galleries and they sat through ten hours of talk. That is the sum of it all. The best satisfaction the Suffragists derived is the privilege to say, like the rustic philosopher, "it didn't come out as we expected it would, and we didn't expect it would."

(*Editorial from Boston Transcript.*)

It was a proper and not unexpected disposition of the question of amending the Federal Constitution so as to impose equal suffrage upon all the States that was made by the national House Tuesday. It did not even receive the hospitality that was given to the issue of national prohibition, but fell short of a majority by a substantial margin. While this was a disappointment to some of the leaders of the cause there were others of its friends who welcomed the result, having foreseen that the success of the measure, even if it passed the successive stages, would be securing what they desired in the wrong way. There seemed to be no partisan division upon the matter. Our most seasoned representatives from this State voted against it and doubtless thereby reflected the sentiment of this Commonwealth better than did those who voted for it for reasons that they might have some difficulty in satisfactorily explaining. The people whose importunity brought this question to such a test were merely taking chances in a political lottery and they drew a blank, which under the circumstances was all that was deserved.

This is a change in the suffrage situation that should depend upon persuasion, education and demonstration. There is not the slightest doubt that the advocates of equal suffrage can win their contention in any State wherein it can be shown that the women want the ballot and are ready to assume the full responsibilities that its possession involve. It is desirable and important that wherever this privilege is granted it should be with the assent and good will of those States where it is to be exercised. That would not be the result of Constitutional compulsion. The States that still hold out against it are not conquered provinces for which forms of internal regulation should be imposed. There should be no infraction of those rights which have long been conceded to them, and there is no emergency that would justify such an exceptional delimitation of their powers.

The Directors of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage take this opportunity of stating that they neither endorse nor approve of the anti-suffrage magazine, published monthly, called *The Reply*.

THE DEBATE ON THE SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPRESENTATIVE UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, House Leader, denied that the exercise of the franchise is a universal right.

He said, in part:

"To exercise the franchise in this American Republic is the highest privilege that can be granted. It is no more the right to exercise the franchise than it is a right possessed by man or woman to hold office. * * *

"As the floor leader of the majority of this House, on this occasion I have a right to speak for my party. The Democratic Party has not been silent on this question. It has not attempted to say what should be done in California or in New York or in Alabama. It has not said that the women of any State in the Union should not have the right to exercise the high privilege of the franchise, but it has said that under our Constitution, our laws, in view of the history of our Republic, that this question must be settled by the individual States and not by the National Government. * * *

"This right of suffrage is going to move just as fast as the conditions of the people who seek the privilege warrant them in exercising it. If you try to drive it faster than that you but court disaster and the wreck and ruin of some portions of this country."

REPRESENTATIVE HENRY, of Texas, Chairman of Committee on Rules, spoke in part as follows:

"This House is to-day considering the most important question, in my judgment, with which we have had to deal during forty years. Many gentlemen on that side of the House gleefully embrace the opportunity to speak in favor of this amendment on this occasion. Let me remind them that for sixteen years the Republicans were in power, and these same women were asking for the right to vote upon this amendment in the House of Representatives, and your party steadfastly refused to let it be considered on this floor.

"The Democratic Party has not feared to face the question and to deal with it, as the Republican Party did for years. Your party suppressed much meritorious legislation and many things that should have been considered here, and you went out of power. The Democratic Party is willing to stand the test and cast its votes against the amendment. Without meaning to disparage any representative, when the time comes that the Democracy cannot stand against such amendments as the national prohibition amendment and the Mondell suffrage amendment the mission of our ancient party is ended.

"I am opposed to submitting this question to the respective States for several reasons. In the first place, I am entirely persuaded that a very large majority of American women are utterly opposed to this amendment and are in entire opposition to woman suffrage.

"When this question was laid before the Rules Committee in a three-day hearing the proponents of the amendment politely but firmly declined to allow the American woman to vote upon the proposition.

"Much sentiment has been indulged in here to-day which has not been helpful in the solution of this great problem. Men should face this question resolutely, and they should not let sentiment control them nor should they permit political expediency to determine their attitude upon this amendment.

"There are many who believe that woman suffrage, where it has been adequately tried, has failed, and for a brief moment I want to read to you the language of a distinguished publicist of England and a great lecturer, who is soon to be heard in the National Capitol. I refer to the language of Cecil Chesterton, Esq. Mr. Chesterton states that oppostition to woman suffrage is in no sense one of his strongest convictions. His main reason for disliking it is the strong antagonism to it in England by the overwhelming mass of women in all but the upper and middle classes. He feels that it is in many ways purely a domestic question upon which he cannot see that he has any right as an Englishman to lecture Americans. But there are certain sides of this question that must be carefully kept in mind, and the line that Mr. Chesterton takes in his lecture is as follows:

"'I do not know how you Americans will solve this problem, and it is really not my business to tell you how to solve it, but I would impress upon you this point, that the old idea implied in the voting of the head of the household was not that women were inferior to men—which nobody but an idiot believes—but that voting was to be by families, and not by individuals; and in any arrangement you make you ought to see that the idea of the family as the unit of the nation is not lost.'

"So without discussing the merits of the question of woman suffrage, I have come to the conclusion that the women do not universally desire it. And where it has been tested it has not proved a success. One representative said that if you give the women the right to vote they will destroy the liquor traffic in every State in this Union. Allow me to reply that they have the absolute and unqualified right to vote in California, and yet recently, by a majority of something like 150,000, they failed to establish prohibition in the State of California.

"Let us see about this being one of the natural and inherent rights. Let us not be swayed and carried away by sentiment and political expediency. As an American I love my country well enough not to be willing to scout the idea of State rights and the traditions and history of our fathers who fashioned this Government. We are all Americans. But if we make this departure here to-day and lay our hands upon the sacred rights of the States of this Union to settle the question of suffrage for themselves, we shall have taken from the people of the various States every vestige of power they have to control, not only their domestic concerns, but the affairs of this Republic in its entirety. Permit me for a moment to read from a great authority on suffrage and elections, in order that we may determine the exact basis upon which this question should be argued and settled. This is McCreary on Elections. He says:

"'The right of suffrage is not a natural right, nor is it an absolute, unqualified personal right. It is a right derived in this country from constitutions and statutes. It is, as we have seen, regulated by the States, and their power to fix the qualifications of others is limited only by the provisions of the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution, which forbids any distinction on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude, and by the general power of the Federal Government to regulate its own elections.'

"Why is it that you wish this amendment proposed and sent to the various States? The States have the power to confer this right upon women whenever they see proper. And I surmise that the fact that the friends of this provision have come to this body and have asked this remedy to-day is because they see and know and feel that their efforts have been futile and will be futile in various States of the Union.

"I am not willing that the States of California, Colorado and Wyoming shall say to the people of Texas how we shall direct our domestic concerns and our affairs in regard to voting and

elections. Nor do I have any desire to say to them how they shall deal with those questions when they have them up for consideration.

"There is but one safe and wholesome doctrine for us here. Revere the constitutional guarantees of the States and remove not 'the ancient landmarks of our fathers.'

"I am one of those who believe in the right and ability of the people of the State to govern and control themselves. Notwithstanding I may be regarded as an old-fashioned Democrat, I announce here to-day my devotion to local self-government, State rights, State integrity and the power of the people to govern themselves, and shall hold steadfastly to that faith."

THE testimony of Representative Lenroot, of Wisconsin, is valuable because it comes from a believer in the theory of woman suffrage. Mr. Lenroot doubtless had in mind the 70,000 majority against woman suffrage in his State of Wisconsin in 1912 when he said:

"My vote upon this amendment will be governed by the same principles, in large part, that governed my vote upon the prohibition resolution. When that resolution was before the House I stated that 'I believed that Congress never should propose an amendment unless, in its judgment, there is a well-settled, deliberately formed public opinion of such extent as to make it probable, at least, that if submitted the amendment will be ratified by the necessary number of States in the very near future. That condition does not exist to-day with reference to this subject, and I think no one will claim that it does exist.' The same thing can be said of this resolution. I profoundly believe that every member of Congress has a responsibiliy, and a most solemn one, in the proposing of Constitutional amendments, and it will not be denied in this case, as it was not denied in the case of the prohibition resolution, that there is not such a deliberately formed public opinion with relation to it as to make it probable, at least, that if submitted it will be adopted in the very near future. * * *

"What is the evidence that public opinion is not so well settled and so well established that we should not submit this at this time? During the past five years woman suffrage has prevailed in seven States. At the last election it was submitted in seven States and defeated in five States. What are we to gather from that action? That there is a well-settled public demand for an amendment to the Federal Constitution in this respect? I ask you, sir, is not such public opinion as has been expressed directly to the contrary?

"I am sorry that that condition prevails, because I believe in woman suffrage. I have perhaps made as many speeches for it as any member of this House not from a woman-suffrage State, but because as I view it public sentiment does not justify me in voting for the amendment, I cannot give it my vote."

ANOTHER Wisconsin member, Mr. Stafford, gave valuable contributions to the discussion: "For years in Wisconsin we have had limited woman suffrage, permitting them to express their views on matters pertaining to school affairs, and yet we find but a meager fraction of the women exercising this franchise. If the women of Wisconsin decline to avail themselves of this limited suffrage as to school affairs, which certainly must be of deep concern to every woman, what reason is there for the people of Wisconsin believing that with unlimited woman suffrage the franchise would be exercised more generally? If a majority of the women of my State favored woman suffrage and I believed that they would exercise it I should not withhold the suffrage from them. * * *

"In Wisconsin we have had woman suffrage submitted to a vote of the people. Only 14 out of 71 counties registered their approval of it. Fifty-seven had clear majorities, many of them twice and a few three times as many against it. A total majority of more than 70,000 against it. There is no objection to Illinois saying that they should have woman suffrage, and if perchance Wisconsin or any other State through its men and women are opposed to having woman suffrage, why impose it upon us who believe it is not well for the polity of the State to extend the franchise? Why, if after a trial of woman suffrage it was demonstrated that but one-tenth of the women of the State, and that of a separate class, should exercise it, would you believe it should be within the rights of the State to withdraw the right of suffrage from this one class of women who perchance would exercise it? Yet if we had national compulsory woman suffrage a State would lose its right to determine its policy and withdraw the franchise from women, even though nine-tenths of the women in the State were opposed to its exercise. Certainly, the framers of the Constitution enacted wisely when they left all matters pertaining to the internal policy of the States to the States themselves."

REPRESENTATIVE WEBB, of North Carolina, claimed that the Suffragists represent a small minority of women.

"The highest good of the community as a whole has precedence over the wishes of any class; the legislation and conventions of the future must be based not upon any plea for liberty, but upon solid considerations of general human welfare.

"No country in the world has emancipated women so rapidly as has the United States, and yet woman Suffragists positively refuse to submit the question of women voting to women themselves, but demand that we men shall thrust the ballot into the hands of women, even though they do not ask it.

"I venture the statement that were the question of women voting submitted to the women of the United States more than 80 per cent. would express themselves against it. * * *

"I am well aware that extreme Suffragists, feminists, Socialists and I. W. W.'s will say that my ideas on the question of woman suffrage are out of date and antiquated, but I beg to remind all such critics that this Government has grown in power and population as no other country on earth has grown, and for more than 100 years has been known the world over as the land of the brave and the home of the free—and all this marvelous growth has come about and this splendid reputation attained without the aid of woman's ballot.

"If I thought woman suffrage was best for my country, or even for womankind, I would gladly support it, but believing sincerely that it would be harmful to both I shall stubbornly oppose it."

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN DIES, of Texas, said in part:

"The leaders of this movement talk about votes for women as if it was a great boon, when as a matter of fact it is a burdensome responsibility. There is a growing tendency upon the part of all classes of voters to refrain from discharging their duty to vote, and this tendency becomes more aggravated with the increase of the number of elections and the new and strange problems the voter is called upon to solve. We will at no distant time be driven to compulsory voting unless our rampant reformers can be induced to leave their nostrums off the ballots of the people.

"It is no reflection upon the intelligence of the women that they are not as well qualified by nature, by custom, and by preparation for the business of government as men are. No more is it a reflection upon the intelligence of men to say that they are not as well qualified as women for the still more important business of governing the home, training the youth, and mothering mankind. It is no reflection upon the intelligence of the wisest layman voter to say to him that he is better fitted to make laws through representatives than directly. And one of the reasons for that is that the great body of men must devote their energies and talents to their several avocations and have not time to specialize in the business of lawmaking. So it is with woman suffrage. Women are already fully engaged in the world's most important work; men are utterly incompetent to take woman's place in her natural sphere, and it would be turning back the wheels of progress to foist upon women a new set of minor duties, the discharge of which would inevitably lower her standard of efficiency in the vastly more important field in which she is so happily preeminent and so preeminently qualified.

The man and the woman mind are essentially different. This organic difference has been accentuated by centuries of training and practice along different lines. The mind of man rather runs to prosaic reasoning, while the mind of woman is given to poetical idealism. It is inevitable that woman's natural bent of mind should incline her to socialism, and nothing would set socialism up in business as quickly as woman suffrage. The Socialist Party recognizes this, and as a result are almost to a man for woman suffrage.

"But some of our Suffragette friends tell us that men have made a failure with this Government, and that therefore women are needed as voters. I deny it. This Republic is not a failure. On the contrary, it is the greatest success in all the time and tide of human things. Perfect, no; but by the test of comparison, and there is no other standard by which to measure it, this representative democracy established by men who won their right to build it upon the battlefield, is the nearest approach to perfection of all governments this old world has ever seen. In no other government of any age was there every so great a measure of human liberty, and in no other government has woman occupied so exalted a place and exercised so deep an influence as in these United States.

"Without the aid of your mothers, women of America, our fathers could never have wrought this wonderful fabric, and without your help we can not hope to maintain it. But we need the same kind of aid your mothers gave to our fathers.

"I am not unmindful that it is not given to all women to have homes and husbands and children. Some are compelled to wage the hard battle of life single-handed. I know that thousands of women, brave and true, are driven to struggle in the busy marts of trade, in factories, stores and workshops. Many of them receive pitifully small wages from the hands of pitiless masters. But men have the ballot, and are they better off? Thousands of men are constantly without work, and many stalk empty-handed to the bread line. Men, too, are underpaid. Millions of men brave the sea for a pittance and dig deep into the bowels of the earth, shut out from the light of the sun. If voting would cure the evils of poverty or mollify the exactions of the taskmaster, why do not men vote themselves into Utopian bliss. I am persuaded to believe that the lot of man, notwithstanding his monopoly of the ballot, is fully as hard as that of woman. In good truth we can not banish the troubles of the world by statute. If women could draft a bill that would cure the ills that beset them, they could pass it through a legislature of men with lightening speed, quicker, no doubt, than they could pass it through a lawmaking body of their own sex. There is not a member of this Congress who would not give all that he possesses to be the author of a law that would add to the happiness of womankind. The trouble is that we men do not know how to make the world perfect by law any more than you good women do, and the only reason any of the women think they could do that impossible thing is because they never had a chance to try their hands. That this is the case is amply demonstrated by conditions in those States that have female suffrage. Women are not better protected in Montana than in Nevada, and in the double-suffrage Colorado there are still strikes, bloodshed and strife, and the soldiers from other States are needed to keep the peace. In good truth, my dear sisters, you can not better serve your Government than by keeping to the tasks nature fitted you for, and in the discharge of which you have been so splendidly successful. Incidentally, you can also promote the cause of good government by not interfering with your brothers in the discharge of the task which God and immemorial custom seem to have appointed them to.

This is a serious question. Eleven States, I believe, have already adopted State suffrage for women. I know the kind of stuff candidates for Presidents are made of and that political parties are made of. They are just common clay, and sometimes the commonest kind of clay. And I warn the country now that those of us who are opposed to adding this new burden and responsibility to the womanhood of America must be up and doing. Our candidates for President and national platform builders will stampede at the demand of the double-suffrage States unless we raise our voices in protest and give courage to candidates and politicians. Candidates and the builders of platforms are also made of common clay, and, in fact, sometimes a lot of uncommonly bad clay is worked into the construction. Politicians are so keen to give the people all that the people want that sometimes in their fear and excitement they give the people a dose that the people do not want. I believe this woman-suffrage agitation is likely to prove a case in point. It, therefore, behooves every man and woman who sees danger in this movement to sound the alarm.

"TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION"—MISAPPLIED

By Mrs. George P. White

Chairman of the Organizing Committee, Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

THE oldest, as well as the most common plea for woman suffrage is the attempt to apply the war cry of our Revolutionary forefathers to the case of "votes for women."

"Taxation without representation," they tell us, is why our ancestors fought the British and gained independence. They do not, of course, recall that it was National representation in the British Parliament and not a question of individual voting that was associated with this question of 1776. But about the first thing the Suffragists did after their organization in 1848 was to parody the Declaration of Independence by a "woman's declaration," which is worth reading and comparing with the original document by Thomas Jefferson, in order to get a clearer insight into the workings of the typical suffrage mind.

Most of the present-day followers of the "cause" do not mention this, and the older element would fain forget it, but it remains indelibly impressed on the movement, and proclaims its origin and its force to consist in a ceaseless desire to imitate the things done by men. Of course, accuracy and a sense of proportion could not be hoped for under these circumstances. The inalienable rights to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" in the Declaration of Independence were applied by the feminists to mean that a woman has a "right" to vote if it makes her happy to do so; the list of oppressions and usurpations of the liberties of the American colonies by George III were made over into a "list or grievances" for the individual woman who was dissatisfied; the grinding taxation imposed on our whole country at that time by a monarch who quartered large bodies of troops on our people, dismissed legislatures and repealed laws at will has been altered to serve as an excuse for a woman's dodging the tax collector because she doesn't vote.

What has taxation to do with suffrage? Very much under feudalism, very little under democracy. If taxation suffrage is the thing desirable, then Germany and Russia are the most democratic nations on earth!

In Germany the thing is worked out scientifically, so that the Prussian landlord has six times the representation given the peasant in other German States, and though more men vote in Germany in proportion to population than in any other country, the system of electors which has survived the "Holy Roman Empire" has put the whole nation under the domination of Prussia and Potsdam. In the German Reichstag only a majority vote is necessary to pass legislation—apparently a more democratic system than required in our Congress and legislatures in many instances—but that majority vote does not often register the will of the majority of the people, but the will of the ruler and the nobles.

In Russia, though practically universal manhood suffrage prevails, the system of electing representatives gives the workman's and peasant's vote very little value compared with the property owner's and the noble's.

In America we are, or at least believe we are, more free than in Russia or Germany, and why? Because suffrage is not based on taxation or inherited property but on manhood, and gives the multi-millionaire and the street-sweeper an equal vote. But how did the street-sweeper become the political equal to the man with millions? By paying taxes? By intelligence? By education? No, but by force of arms—by becoming the millionaire's equal on the firing line. Every great government and every great change in government has been brought about as the echo of war. This is history, not theory.

Politics, as Senator Root once said, is modified warfare. The only way to decide a question of tribal policy in the earliest forms of government was to go out and fight till one faction won control. Finally this troublesome system was avoided by a show of hands to signify on which side the warrior would fight—and the ballot was born. Some tribes outfought and disarmed and then enslaved others, only to be overcome, in turn, by more vigorous and younger races. The nations with the most warlike ability developed the most independence in the individual. As the Norman, the Celt, and the Saxon learned that his king depended on his strength at arms to keep the kingdom, he demanded the registration of his own opinion in the councils of the government, not as a taxpayer or according to his riches, but as a unit of the force on which government rests.

Recently an American statistical expert was discussing the frequent revolutions in Southern countries with the then President of Hayti. "In that matter, the only difference between my country and yours," said the President, "is that you have a system whereby officials count each side in an election to see which is the strongest while down here, with no census bureau, we have to fight it out to ascertain which side is in the majority."

Law, politics, externals are after all a matter of force, and force is a matter of manhood. Why do nine men consent to be ruled by the nominee of ten men? Certainly not because the nine are convinced that the ten are wiser. But because ten are stronger. And in our—now partially civilized—democracy we don't fight it out, we content ourselves with a show of hands, knowing always that behind the hands are the arms, behind the arithmetic the enforceable wills of the ten against the nine.

Pretty theories would have us believe that government is merely a humanitarian enterprise—"public housekeeping," as the Suffragists say. They forget that if we were all perfectly just and honest and obeyed the golden rule at all times we wouldn't need any government or any laws besides the Sermon on the Mount. But government is the embodiment of the force for which the majority of the men will fight to preserve it against other forces. In the nature of things it limits the freedom of the few for the good of the many—imprisons criminals, protects life and property, safeguards our rights and liberties, not by opinion, but by force.

It is for this force, this protection, that we pay taxes to maintain police, judges, legislatures, not as "public housekeepers," but as officers to carry out by force, if necessary, the common will, or the policy of the majority.

In taking the ballot the man assumes sovereign responsibility for the maintenance of the laws and the enforcement of judicial decrees. He becomes at once liable to jury service, to police duty, to take his place on the firing line in defense of the government and its laws. Consequently he gets his right to vote, not as a natural inheritance of his "humanity," but because he assumes a corresponding responsibility and duty in carrying out by force, if need be, his decision at the polls.

The alien, without a vote, pays taxes. The corporation, without a vote, pays taxes under every government which protects its business and its property. The minor, though a male and a "human being," without the vote, must pay taxes. The estate held in trust, without a vote, must pay taxes. Why? Is it not because taxes are the price of protection to life and property? But our government couldn't be kept up without money, you say. Very true, but manhood and not money is the democratic unit force on which government rests. Otherwise the rich would rule and the poor be slaves, as has often been the case before men learned that it is the number of men and not dollars that determines the direction governmental policy shall take.

Of course money still plays a part. There are mercenaries as well as patriots, men who will sell their votes and soldiers who will betray their country for a price—but they are in the hopeless minority.

But what about women? Don't they take part in war as nurses and produce the soldiers, and shouldn't they have a chance to say whether their sons shall be sacrificed in battle? Yes, they do and they should have a voice in the question of war and peace. But as the nurse is not less than but different from the soldier and doing a different duty, so the woman is not less than but different from the man, and her duty is not on the firing line of partisan politics—but behind it. The woman in war as a nurse is a non-combatant; her part is not to strengthen but to soften the strife, to soothe and heal, not to shoot and kill. And in relation to government, woman's part is not to join issue with the political parties fighting a modified warfare for the administration of its forces, but to be behind the battle of ballots, the moderator, the non-combatant, the non-partisan inspirer of men in the fields where force is spiritual, educational, moral, instead of physical.

Woman is not man's physical equal, and as long as human government rests on force, physical equality must be based on approximate physical equality. In assuming the one without being able to assume the other, the woman is asking for a privilege for which she must sacrifice protection. And protection she must have in order to mother the race. The different physical relationship to the child establishes a vital and natural difference between man and woman, mother and father, that no amount of theory can alter. Sex differentiation and limitation is not a matter of mere training, as the feminists would have us believe, but a matter of physical difference. For instance, the man may become the father of the largest family and never lose a day from the hardest manual labor, whereas the woman certainly cannot become a mother without great organic changes, both physical and mental, during which she must have rest and protection. And, if the decision recently made in the teacher-mother controversy, namely, that a woman needs two years leave of absence to mother one child; and the statistics showing that women must bear an average of 4.5 children to perpetuate the race, and that 70 per cent. of all women over 15, 80 per cent. of all women over 35 and 90 per cent. of all women at 45 are married mean anything, it is plain that our politics and our government must be ruled by these considerations, and not by the theories of a few feminists.

As for taxation, the taxpayer's chief interest is not in voting, but in getting the cheapest and the most efficient protection. This, whether man or woman, he or she does best under male suffrage. Colorado, with 21 years of woman suffrage, has the weakest State government, but the highest per capita tax rate in the Union. Wyoming, with 45 years of woman suffrage, has a higher percentage of public servants than any other State, and even distances the District of Columbia in this regard. California and Oregon, with only three years of woman suffrage, are complaining of increased taxation from legislative fads, an emotional electorate and a mechanically doubled vote.

Furthermore, it is common knowledge that the greater the percentage of non-taxpayers among the electorate, the more ready the voters are to foist upon the State all manner of burdensome expense. Everyone admits that the government would be more economically managed if every voter paid taxes. Self-interest would see to that. And since there are more of this non-taxpaying group among women than among men, woman suffrage adds immeasurably to the irresponsible element in the electorate and tends to increase the burdens of the State and raise taxes.

The women do not want the vote, and want it less the more they become familiar with its real use. Where they have school suffrage, as in Massachusetts and North Dakota, we find increasing indifference at each election, and a correspondingly growing anti-suffrage sentiment. In Chicago the women's vote has shrunk at each election since they got partial suffrage in Illinois. And though the changes wrought by woman suffrage have been all on the side of increased taxation and expense, without any corresponding benefit, without any good to women or the State, feminists demand an extension of the experiment throughout the country. The woman who influences man a thousandfold more than men influence each other in the higher and nobler things of life, who is represented in her sons as well as her daughters; at the throttle of the locomotive, the wheel of the ocean liner and in the administration of the Ship of State by manhood which puts "women and children first" is told that she has "no representation" unless she votes. She has "taxation without representation" she is told, and therefore the feminists would double her taxation and plunge her into politics she cannot hope to control, in order to give her "representation" on a piece of paper without responsibility or power to physically uphold it. She is asked to surrender her first-class womanhood, and pay more taxes, to become the political equal of the second-rate man. And because they are asked this is the reason so many taxpaying women are Anti-Suffragists. One of the best informed Suffragists announced a year ago that the "taxation argument" had been abandoned by all "up-to-date" feminists; but apparently not many are "up-to-date," because we meet it constantly, in print and on platform, as excuse for woman suffrage.

A CREED

We believe in every possible advancement to woman.

We believe that this advancement should be along those legitimate lines of work and endeavor for which she is best fitted and for which she has now unlimited opportunities.

We believe this advancement will be better achieved through strictly non-partisan effort and without the limitation of the ballot.

We believe in Progress, not in Politics, for women.

REFORM DUE TO PUBLIC OPINION, NOT POLITICS

By Erol Howe
Member of the New York Legislature.

(In writing under date of January 19, 1915, to Suffragists who had asked his position on suffrage, Assemblyman Howe gave his views in no uncertain way. We reproduce extracts from his letter.—Editor's Note.)

I THINK that for the present, at least, under existing conditions, the operation of the machinery of government had better be left where it is. It is not pretended that the present operation is altogether satisfactory—the question is, will universal woman suffrage improve it? The answer must, of course, always remain more or less one of opinion which even experiment might not satisfy, as people's ideas of improvement will always differ. I believe, however, that there is a conscientious and constant effort on the part of the men towards improvement in governmental methods in this State. I doubt if any acceleration of this effort would follow from woman suffrage or that if it did it would be worth the drawbacks involved in other ways. In this connection we are faced with a really fundamental consideration. I believe that in this State the real direction of daily human activities and family life still rests inevitably with the man and that until human nature and conditions of life change greatly this will continue to be the case. There are no doubt many and patent individual exceptions, but for practical purposes most families look to masculine muscle, temperament and habits of thought for support, protection and guidance just as they look to the woman for the more subtle and lovable human attributes. There is no question of right or wrong or sentiment involved in this; it is a simple natural fact which no man or woman is responsible for or should resent. Our Government is the result of and is grounded on a recognition of this fact, and it is on the whole a good government and daily growing better. Voting is merely a practical expedient incidental to this fact and is not to be confused with government itself. I believe that nothing compensatory would be gained and much might be lost to women as well as to men by trying to extend this incidental function beyond those who at present seem to be its natural custodians and who seem to me on the whole to be making conscientious and encouraging use of it.

I do not believe that universal woman suffrage is necessary for the accomplishment of proper reforms that peculiarly affect the women of New York State. I can well understand the exasperation of capable and patriotic women who pay taxes and their husband's bills at the delay in the institution of such reforms and their very natural feeling that the vote would give them a power they do not now possess to influence legislation in their behalf. But here again possible good must be weighed against possible evil. Moreover, the curative value of legislation as such, in my opinion, is much exaggerated anyway. I see no hope that a universal female vote will put in our legislatures men or women who will be better than the men now put there by a universal male vote, and I greatly fear that such is masculine human nature that women might lose under conditions of competition much influence they now have to help both themselves and men. The right kind of man in our Legislature will always welcome feminine aid and will perhaps make more use of it than a woman would—certainly more than the wrong kind of woman. I do not believe that the frequent absence at present from the Legislature of the right kind of man is due to the absence of women's votes, or that an unrestricted female vote would necessarily put the right kind of man there. The fact is that reform legislation of any real value is not the result of political influence but of the pressure of public opinion. The public opinion of women in New York is as highly valued and respected as that of men.

Finally, I am not satisfied that at the present time most or the most important part of the women of this State want the vote. No doubt your (suffrage) organization feels they ought to want it and would want it if sufficiently informed concerning it. So, too, the mere opinion, or lack of opinion, of a possibly unenlightened majority of the women would not necessarily be in itself a valid argument against the soundness of your views on the general pros and cons of woman suffrage. But I do not believe that the privileges involved in the possesson of the vote should be accorded to the women of this State or the correlative duties required of them unless and until they want to receive and assume them, or that any proportion of the women of this State, however sincere and patriotic, as long as they are a minority of all would care to impose on the rest against their wills a function involving grave responsibilities that might be a burden, or at the least might be neglected or abused. There can be no objection to any proper campaign of education, but the hasty imposition of a political status in advance of the ascertained consent of the recipients is a very different thing. Not only might such action do much unnecessary harm, but it would be also in serious conflict with the very ideas of inherent right of women to control their own destinies on which I have no doubt your organization's aspirations are largely based.

I trust that I have made myself clear in this brief discussion of a very large topic. The subject presents itself to me as one of practical, present-day local expediency. For this reason I have made no reference to conditions in other States, to abstractions ethical or psychological or to the possibilities that the future may develop.

A DEADLY PARALLEL

CALIFORNIA DOCTORS DISAGREE

THEORY	vs.	FACT
"There is not one single honest argument to be advanced against the sharing of the responsibilities of government, of social adjustment, with women, except such as is founded on the belief of their inherent inferiority and their proper subservience to our great, good, our sober, intelligent, clean and righteous male selves."—Representative Kent of California, *Congressional Record, Jan.* 12, 1915.		"Results show that in this State women refuse to accept the obligation which at their request or upon their apparent acquiescence has been imposed upon them or to discharge the resulting duties. No intelligent man claims that women are less competent than men to vote. Very few men object to women voting, if they will do it. And neither will any wise person assert that it is for the public interest to have in the electorate great masses of electors who refuse to vote.—*San Francisco Chronicle,* December 6, 1914.

WILL WOMAN'S VOTE RAISE WOMEN'S WAGES?

Suffrage—and Women's Wages

(*Philadelphia Inquirer*, Dec. 9, 1914.)

DEALING especially with the interests of working girls, Mrs. A. J. George, in part said (at an anti-suffrage meeting):

"We have recently had some agitation upon the wages of working girls. This evil must be checked at its source by training our girls as skilled workers. Education—education, and more education—not of the top-heavy sort, but a training of hand and eye to skillful performance. Trade schools, and not voting booths are the solution of this evil.

"After two generations of more or less thoughtless exploitation of women as wage earners, we are beginning to see that the woman goes into industry to meet all the hardships and problems of the working man, and takes with her the handicap of her sex, of her lower physical and nervous vitality. Our laws begin to recognize that women must be especially protected because the potential motherhood of the race must be protected.

"It is the glory of our States where industrial conditions have made manifest the terrible cost at which the State uses its women in industry that those States have responded to the need of conserving their womanhood. We have the Fifty-four Hour law, Minimum Wage Commission, the prohibition of night work in manufacturing and mercantile pursuits in Indiana, Nebraska, Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania, although women do not vote in these States. An electoral body of men has created the best protective legislation for the working woman. It has yet to be shown that women electors as a body in any one State have evolved policies unknown to any other single non-suffrage State and distinct from the normal trend of present day progress in which men and women play their diverse parts.

"All over the country women released by personal circumstances from the duties of normal women are doing splendid constructive work. This work is done with precision and excellence in proportion as these women keep away from political affiliations. They have no personal political ambition to gratify; their service is rendered for the public good."

Economic Independence

Speaking at another meeting in Philadelphia, Mrs. George said:

"A pamphlet which bears the imprint of the National Woman Suffrage Association informs us that 'the free woman's concern is to see to it that she shall be in a position to bear children if she wants them without soliciting maintenance from any man, whoever he may be, and this she can only do if she is earning money for herself or is provided for out of some common fund for a limited time . . . It is neither desirable nor necessary for women when they are mothers to lose their chosen money-earning work for any length of time. The fact that they do largely rests on a tradition which has been worn down.'

"In other words, just at the moment when experts have found that the child is better off in a poor home than in a good institution; when mothers' pensions and mothers' aid acts are enacted to allow working women to remain in the home to care for their own children, along come the suffragist feminists, who strive for the economic independence of women, and who frankly say that in order to relieve woman from her old duties the State must undertake the care of the child.

"While some women are calling for 'votes for women' others, alive to the right of the child to be mothered, are devising means by which the homeless child may be taken from the institutions and put in the individual home. Women belong to the department of construction. If they will do their task well there will be no need of a department of repair. It is no answer to say that man has not done well. I am optimistic enough to think he has done exceedingly well considering who has trained him, and the remedy for the ill he has done is not in taking his task or confusing it with our own, but to train, inspire and lead him better."

The Wage-Earners' Protest

HON. C. O. LOBECK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR:

In behalf of the Wage-Earners' League of the City of Omaha, we appeal to you to cast your ballot in opposition to the suffrage bill for an amendment striking out the word "male" from our Federal Constitution.

Our opposition to suffrage is based on the conviction that it is detrimental to the shop or factory girl; to the office girl and to the business or professional woman—all of whom are included in the membership of our League.

We do not want the "privilege" of the ballot. We realize that added privileges mean added responsibilities, and we are now carrying all that we care to bear.

Nor do we want "equal rights." We are both cognizant and appreciative of the laws which have been passed by the men of Nebraska for the benefit of our sex—laws which are in every respect superior to those of our neighboring State where equal suffrage prevails.

For these and other reasons we trust that the vote of our Representative at Washington may be in line with the wishes of the majority of his constituents, as shown at the ballot box on November last.

Respectfully yours,
(Signed) MAY MCNAMARA, Pres.,
ALICE C. GILCHRIST, Sec.,
Wage-Earners' League.

OMAHA, NEB., Dec. 24, 1914.

Miss Tarbell's Opinion

THAT suffrage is not a panacea for working women was the view expressed on January 19th by Miss Ida M. Tarbell, the writer, in testifying before the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations, which is investigating the workings of the Rockefeller, Carnegie, Russell Sage and Baron De Hirsch Foundations.

"Women get lower wages than men because they are unskilled and are regarded as temporary employees," said Miss Tarbell. "Suffrage might help, but I am not sure. Personally, I do not want to see women get mixed up in politics. Most men I know favor suffrage for women; it is the women themselves who will have to keep it away. The greatest help for women workers has come in States where they do not vote."

As for suffrage minimizing vice and tending to secure the enforcement of law, Miss Tarbell said she did not believe it exercised any considerable influence.

"Have Women Solved the Domestic Labor Problem?"

A MAN in a letter to the New York *Herald* asks women whether they have so elevated their own peculiar province, society, whether they have so solved the problem of domestic labor—whether in fact they have done their part so well—that they need offer to do the man's share too. It is a fair question.

Suffragists seem unable to understand that the function of government is but a part of life, and that not the creative, but the corrective part. The wide-spread indifference of women to politics is simply an evidence of this, and is largely a wholesome indifference, leaving their interest and enthusiasm for that part of life which is their business, and for which they need all the energy they have.

JUDGE GRAY'S OPPOSITION TO SUFFRAGE

(Extract from a letter to Mrs. Henry B. Thompson, Chairman, "The Women's Committee of Delaware Opposed to Woman Suffrage," by George Gray, of Wilmington.)

IT is significant that, in all the literature and in the public addresses made by Suffragists, no one can point to a single substantial grievance that is being endured or suffered by women, by reason of their never having had the vote. The only grievance, apparently, is the denial to them of that right. Nor has it ever been shown satisfactorily to any unbiased mind that, during the wonderful progress that has characterized the civilization of the last century, the influence of women has not had a due part in that advance, nor are there any activities that tend to promote the well-being, moral or material, of the community, from which they are debarred, or in which their influence is not felt, irrespective of their possession of the electoral franchise.

Believing that no good can come to this community from the enlargement of the electoral franchise, so as to include women, and that much harm may result from a change so fundamental and radical in our social and political life, I am unalterably opposed to any action by our Legislature in this direction. It would seem the duty of all members of a community who have settled convictions in a matter of this kind, to express them, with due respect to those who may differ, in order that a just public opinion may be formed.

THE EBBING OF THE SUFFRAGE TIDE

EASTERN Suffragists are now assuring us that two men out of three seem to favor their cause, and that suffrage is bound to come. Ohio Suffragists felt the same way—before election! They had no difficulty in getting thousands more than were needed to sign their petition to have the question submitted to the people, and they could collect a crowd almost anywhere without sending off a stick of dynamite, as was Margaret Foley's method in Nevada. They were so confident of success that they declared that Ohio would start a suffrage landslide in the East. But somehow on election day things didn't go as they expected; the adverse majority of 87,000 in 1912 jumped to 182,000 in 1914—which the Suffragists call an "abnormal" majority. In 1912 they blamed the "wets" for their defeat; this time they say it was the "drys" that did it. It is interesting that the drys got more than twice as big a majority against them as the wets!

In Michigan in 1912 the Suffragists were defeated by only 700 votes. They were so sure it was bound to come that they asked the voters to vote on it again six months later, when the adverse majority rose to 96,000. Since then they have not felt so sure about its coming. Missouri, too, they claimed as "almost sure." The men there were perfectly willing to sign petitions to have the question submitted to the people and to let the ladies talk to their hearts' content. But there, too, something happened on election day—an adverse majority of 140,000. Now Mrs. Miller, the Missouri suffrage leader, admits that they knew all the time that they would be beaten, and that their confident talk was only bluff. Can the same thing be true in the East? The New York Suffragists paint "Victory" on their banners, but they try to get insured for $25,000 against defeat!

The result of their strenuous and expensive campaign in seven States was that they won in two sparsely settled mining States by majorities amounting to 7,000. They lost in five States by majorities amounting to 360,000. To maintain, in the face of these facts and figures, that suffrage is likely to carry in any of the large Eastern States may be bluff or it may be self-deception—it can only be one or the other. Besides being defeated at the polls in five States, suffrage was defeated in 1913 in the Legislatures of South Carolina, Mississippi, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky and Rhode Island.

Suffragists argue that, because suffrage has been defeated in certain States which afterward adopted it, the recent defeats are merely way stations on the road to success. But every year that suffrage is delayed means less likelihood of its coming at all, for people are becoming better informed as to the fact that suffrage has not made good where it has been tried, and to the fact that women can accomplish more for the public good outside politics. Even Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, the English ex-militant, who is in this country because there is nothing doing in her line at home, admits this. Speaking of the wonderful work for social betterment women are doing in this country and of women's power, she says: "In England the women have turned their attention to politics, and they have accomplished nothing like so much in civic reform." This is straight American anti-suffrage doctrine, and it is gratifying to have its truth at once so apparent to Mrs. Lawrence. An ever-increasing number of American men and women are seeing this truth, and it is on that account that in the East it is such a long, long road to woman suffrage that the goal is out of sight.

MARGARET C. ROBINSON.

(*From the Boston Herald, Jan.* 15, 1915.)

"An Ill-Advised, Hateful Attempt at Coercion"

(*From the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan.* 3, 1915.)

THE Constitution of the United States makes granting the elective franchise a State function. Each State may determine for itself who may and who may not vote. Under the influence of the sectional hatred growing out of the Civil War by an amendment to the Constitution we conferred the right of suffrage upon the negro with more disastrous and permanent results to the negro than to any other class of the Southern people. The negroes do not vote, but they are prevented from voting partly by terrorism and partly by laws which the Supreme Court does not dare to declare unconstitutional, although they accomplish indirectly that which could not be accomplished directly.

The fifteenth amendment could not be enforced in the Southern States according to its real meaning without producing another rebellion. And that is fully recognized by the Government and the courts.

The advocates of woman's suffrage seem determined to force the adoption of their fad upon all the States whether desired by the people of those States or not. There is certainly no Northern State, and possibly no State, in which the suffrage will not be granted to women if a majority of them will ask it. In this and other States the franchise has been given without waiting for the request of a majoriy of the sex, and, as the event has shown, without the desire of a majority. It is more than probable that were the question of the withdrawal of the right submitted to vote in this State, with the women voting, the right would be withdrawn. There are multitudes of women who would register for such an election for the sole purpose of getting rid of a duty which they detest, and whose obligations they refuse to fulfill.

The action of the women coercionists who are insisting on urging a Constitutional amendment which would impose woman suffrage on States whose people do not want it is not only particularly hateful, but from their own standpoint very ill-advised.

Opposition to the persistent and intolerant efforts of these half crazy leaders is likely to produce opposition to their cause where now none exists, and even to lead, by the aid of the women themselves, to the withdrawal of the franchise where it is already established.

Nothing could prove more conclusively the unfitness of these zealots who are leading this movement to be themselves intrusted with the franchise than the recklessness with which they assault the very foundations of our political structure in their determination to get for women what the majority of women do not want. They make people tired.

"I Shatter, Shatter as I go To Plan Some Fresh Disaster"

(Christabel Pankhurst declares the militants will renew their campaign of destruction unless the vote is granted when the war is over.—NOTE.)

BY BERTHA HUDSON

(*In The Anti-Suffrage Review.*)

I come from haunts of loot and coin
  To make the wide world wonder,
Through town and vale I leave my trail
  Of pillage and of plunder.

Through thirty streets I hurry down,
  Or slip between the sentries—
By twenty wiles—in sacred piles,
  To make explosive entries.

Till last in England's hall I stand,
  Where kings are crowned in glory,
And with a firebrand in my hand,
  Besmirch its ancient story.

I chatter on through thorny ways
  Of votes to hostile hearers,
I bubble o'er with frenzy sore,
  I babble on to jeerers.

And many a fire aflame I set
  In many a church and structure.
With minds beset, the clerics fret,
  They fear my further fructure.

I shatter, shatter, as I go
  To plan some fresh disaster,
For while men wait and hesitate
  I hack a grand "Old Master."

I sneak about, and in and out,
  With here a hammer nailing,
And here and there I *seat* a chair,
  Or chain myself to railing.

And here and there a "buster" bomb,
  Upon me as I travel,
And in my wake I windows break
  With gusto—also gravel.

I shriek and shout and kick about,
  I bite a badgered "bobby";
I clout and spout at royal route
  To ride *my* little hobby.

I yell, I screech, I tumble down
  Like some unloosened fury,
With scorn and frown my sentence drown,
  And heed not judge nor jury.

And wreck things all along and go
  To make the whole world shiver,
For though men hate, they hesitate,
  So I go on forever.

HOW AND WHEN ALL WAR WILL CEASE

AT the meeting of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage in Æolian Hall on January 14th, Mrs. A. J. George said: "In Cincinnati last October I was assured that if the women of Europe had had the vote for forty years there would have been no war in Europe to-day. (Applause.) Your applause does credit to your hearts, but it does not do credit to your intelligence. (Applause.) Peace is a moral ideal up to the point of national honor. And we shall have peace and not war when the heart has been so educated—when the mind has been so trained that we are ready to arbitrate (perhaps Suffragists and Anti-Suffragists may arbitrate), when we are willing to arbitrate and grant to the other fellow something which he may claim. Peace will come when, through a long process of education, the men and the women come to see not only the great economic waste, but the horrible spiritual loss in selfishness, in lust of gold, in desire for power which is perpetuated, first through commercial strife and then through the inevitable clash of armies. Wars will cease not when one sex or the other desires war to cease, but wars will cease when men and women together—when our common humanity has come to take to their hearts and to their minds the teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ."

"MILITANT NURSING"—NEW PROPAGANDA

IN *Scribner's* for January appears a story, "Coals of Fire," written by Mary Raymond Shipman Andrews, apparently a Suffragist or an Anti-Suffragist with an instinct for satire.

It is fiction, and very imaginative fiction.

It starts with a false premise and follows logically through to a false conclusion.

It assumes for the purposes of its plot that the Suffragists' "We demand" has been miraculously transposed in the flash of an eye to "We serve."

It imagines that the Suffragists of England have abandoned their suffragism and turned over to the nation their entire organization, membership, treasuries and all, for service in nursing the wounded soldiers at the front.

Their motive is, strangely enough, declared to be not that they may aid the nation in its hour of need, but that they may advertise their cause. Their plan is "to heap coals of fire" upon the heads of the voters, thereby shaming them into granting their demands when the war is over. To this end they dress outlandishly in orange-red uniforms, "flame-colored dresses," which must have been very soothing to the wounded whom they served—in imagination—upon the very firing line itself.

The youthful heroine is made to say at its culmination in an address, back in England, with the war over, "We did it . . . to vindicate the greatness . . . of our cause. We did it not as Englishwomen or as *mere human women*, but in a body as the women who believe in women's freedom."

So she says in effect: "We are Suffragists first and women afterward. First suffrage, second women, last our nation."

But all that is imagination.

Let us see what the real situation is.

The war has brought about a cessation of militancy in England because an aroused public would resent it in militant fashion.

There is no evidence, however, that the Suffragists have given up their work of propaganda, although all English women are, as a matter of course, working side by side, not as Anti-Suffragists or Suffragists, for the relief of the wounded.

There seems to be direct evidence that the Suffragists have not given up propaganda, but have discovered a new way of making converts.

In the English *Anti-Suffrage Review* (January), Mrs. Fawcett, a leading Suffragette, is quoted. She says: "Their workers (members of the suffrage organizations attending the wounded) amongst the patients always managed to get in a word on the suffrage question, and the men invariably promised to do everything they could to help forward the movement."

This does not seem honest propaganda. As the *Anti-Suffrage Review* says: "It is hitting Tommy, politically, when he is down. Is there not something very unhallowed in exploiting in this fashion the natural gratitude of a wounded warrior for a kind lady who is nursing him? What would be said of an Anti-Suffragist nurse at the war who 'always managed to get in a word on the suffrage question' in order to get the men to 'promise to do everything' to oppose the movement?"

This certainly seems like taking an unfair advantage. Does it mean that they are nursing in order to make Suffragists or is it that the ruling passion is too strong to be overcome even while nursing?

TRUTH ABOUT REFORM LEGISLATION

VARIOUS speakers who are presently trying to influence public sentiment towards woman suffrage in New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and New Jersey make the plea that "votes for women" are needed to obtain remedial and protective legislation.

A cold comparison of recent reform legislation in this country shows that it has been initiated and established, almost without exception, in States where only men vote, before its enactment in States where women also vote.

The apologists for woman suffrage refer broadly to mothers' pensions, hours and conditions of labor, and various acts to protect industrial workers as practically unattainable without "votes for women." When confronted with the facts of legislation under "man-made laws," however, they either profess ignorance of better laws in male-suffrage States, or admit that such statutes have been enacted because industrial conditions revealed the necessity.

History of Mothers' Pensions

The movement to obtain pensions for mothers originated in male-suffrage States because of the popular conviction that the child is better cared for by its own mother in the home than in public institutions.

Such legislation provides regular income from public treasuries for worthy and destitute mothers, and was first established in Missouri, in April, 1911, and in Illinois in July, 1911, two years before women obtained limited suffrage in the latter State. Colorado, where women have voted 21 years, adopted this legislation in November, 1912. In 1913, in response to public appeal, and regardless of partisan politics and the attitude of voters at the polls, ten more man-suffrage States—Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, South Dakota, New Jersey and New Hampshire—through their legislatures, adopted mothers' pensions. In the same year five more equal suffrage States—California, Idaho, Utah, Washington and Oregon—enacted similar legislation. Wyoming, where women have voted 45 years, Arizona and Kansas, also equal suffrage States, have no mothers' pensions. In all these 19 States, except Colorado, mothers' pensions came about through action by their legislatures, and cannot be traced to electoral influence at the polls.

The following news item is pertinent:

"Atlantic City, N. J., January 17.—Members of the Board of Managers of the National Mothers' Congress, at the closing session to-day of the three days' conference at the Chalfonte, voted to press at once for the enactment of mothers' pension laws in every State of the Union.

"'Investigation has convinced us that the *Pennsylvania act* is the best of the many pension statutes now effective, and we want to see it copied or improved upon by every Commonwealth without a statute for the protection of its widows,' said Mrs. Frederic Schoff, of Philadelphia.

"Decision to force this issue through State branches and by direct appeals to Governors and legislatures was impelled, the national board reported, by statistics showing that a large percentage of the men in the prisons of the country were started on the downward path because their homes were broken up when they were very young."

No "votes for women" were urged, we notice, but, on the contrary, it was proved that a male-suffrage State leads in this legislation, and furthermore, that the broken-up home leads to crime.

A Southern judge, traveling on a railroad train in Alabama with his young niece, a suffrage convert, was asked by her: "Don't you think, Uncle Harry, that women will purify politics when they get the vote?" The mature, world-wise jurist smiled, tore a white edge from his newspaper, rubbed it against the car window and presented the soiled side to her as an answer.

The incident recalls the statement by Cardinal Gibbons, when asked his opinion of woman suffrage: "If woman enters politics she will be sure to carry away on her some of the mud and dirt of political contact."

Why lower the higher moral plane of our womanhood to the level of man's by thrusting the better sex into politics?

Martin Dies, of Texas, said in a speech in the House of Representatives on January 12th, in opposition to the proposed Mondell Bill: "It may be that the entrance of pure women into dirty politics would have a cleansing effect upon the politics, but I cannot believe that it would have that effect upon the women. And in a case of that kind we had better have soiled linen than soiled laundresses."

"Hands Across the Sea"

The following cablegram was received from Lord Curzon from London, England, immediately following the overwhelming defeat of the proposed federal amendment for Woman Suffrage in the House of Representatives:

"Warm congratulations on victory at Washington.

"Curzon, President National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage."

How Suffrage and Mormonism Grow Hand in Hand

To The Editor of The Woman's Protest:

Presumably Mr. Harvey O'Higgins and Miss Harriet Ford, who are reputed near-suffragists, did not intend to write an anti-suffrage play when they created the powerful drama "Polygamy," now running in this city. The primary motive of the play is to expose the inside workings of the Mormon system; but every disinterested play-goer who sees "Polygamy" must admit that the plight of the Mormon woman as here revealed completely knocks out the suffrage theory of the ballot as the instrument of women's emancipation; and vindicates the anti-suffrage contention, that if woman is enslaved—as suffragists affirm all voteless women are—the ballot cannot free her, since hers will be as slavish as herself, and like every subservient vote, a direct invitation to tyranny and corruption.

The futility of the woman-ballot, as exemplified in the case of the Mormon woman, taken in connection with the fact that its extension in the West has followed the expansion of Mormonism—so that suffrage states and the Mormon-controlled states are practically identical—establishes the further fact, that the *net result* of woman-suffrage in this country at least, is to furnish first aid to the Mormon heirarchy. And the *net result* is all that concerns us in the balloting.

As those that believe that the best interests of the race are more truly served by man's looking after the state, and woman's looking after the home, we wish to extend our congratulations and our thanks to the authors of "Polygamy," for putting on the New York stage, at such an opportune time, such a convincing argument against the expediency of woman-suffrage.

(Signed) Mrs. Chas. H. Denison, Mrs. Annie Riley Hale—Guidon Club.

Mrs. John Martin, Mrs. Alice F. MacDougall—N. Y. State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

Mr. Everett P. Wheeler, John C. Ten Eyck, Dr. Rossiter Johnson—Men's Association Opposed to Equal Suffrage.

Woman's Non-Partisanship Her Great Asset

THE old saying that none are so blind as those who will not see has been illustrated by Suffragists many times recently. Suffragists, citing what non-voting women have accomplished, fail to see that these very facts disprove their contention that women need the vote to accomplish betterments. The following letter is pertinent:

To the Editor of The Springfield Republican:

In your issue of December 8th you give a long account of Mrs. Kelly's most interesting speech before the equal suffrage league. I had always supposed that Mrs. Kelly was a Suffragist, but a more eloquent plea for the views of Anti-Suffragists would be far to seek. Mrs. Kelly gives the history of all that women have accomplished in this country from our earliest history down to juvenile courts, the prevention of child labor and other philanthropic movements, all of which women have brought about without the vote. She includes, among other things, the movement for playgrounds. Doubtless women could have initiated this movement also, but, as a matter of fact, it is entirely due to the work of Joseph Lee. That is neither here nor there, however. I merely mention it because it is so peculiarly valuable a movement that the credit should always go to its originator.

Women have done so many immensely valuable things for the social uplift of the world that we do not need any more credit than is ours by right. The great reforms which women have brought about have been accomplished through the arousing of public opinion, without which no law is of any avail, for if the public conscience is not behind a law that law must necessarily fail of enforcement, and with an enlightened public demand the law to carry out that demand is scarcely needed. The public conscience is more easily aroused by women without possessing the ballot than were they able to vote because the knowledge that she is non-partisan is a great asset to a woman who is working along political lines for the public welfare.

MRS. WILLIAM LOWELL PUTNAM.

Boston, December 11, 1914.

Mrs. Ida Husted Harper compares the effect of a recent suffrage meeting on the people at Nashville, Tenn., to a "big religious revival, fairly sweeping them off their feet." In other words, it partook of camp-meeting emotionalism—about the most undesirable quality possible in a convention.

THE EVIL OF MINORITY LEGISLATION

THE power of a well-organized minority to influence legislation has been well set forth in Mr. Taft's recent letter written to correct some misstatements in regard to his address before the Boston Bar Association.

"The subject of my remarks was 'The Evil of Multiplicity of Laws.' I called attention to the fact that there had been passed by Congress and State legislatures 65,000 laws in the last four years, and that such a mass of legislation was an evil of burdensome proportions, as we were rapidly finding out.

"This excess of legislation I attributed to two causes. The first was the erroneous belief that any reform could be accomplished merely by legislation, and the second was that legislators were prone to enact laws, not because they believed their enforcement would do any good, or because they had their enforcement in mind, but only because their votes would profit them politically. Due to this last cause, whenever a part of the electorate in a Congressional district, not a majority, but supposed to hold the balance of power, threatened to plump their votes for or against a Congressional candidate on a particular issue and without regard to their usual party affiliation, they were able to frighten legislators into the legislation which they, as a minority group, demanded. In this wise the amendment for national prohibition secured a majority of the members of the House of Representatives. Many members voted for it who were not really in favor of it, nor did a majority of their constituents demand it. Such members voted for it merely to secure the approval and support of a comparatively small element in the electorate whose votes they feared might defeat them if they voted their own convictions."

UNDER the heading "Votes for Women—Western Experience Fails to Show That Women Desire Them," the San Francisco *Chronicle* (December, 1914) says:

If the women of certain States have had imposed upon them obligations which they do not desire and which they refuse to accept it is because they have failed to present their objections as persistently and vigorously as the women who desire the suffrage have carried on their propaganda.

There is no such thing as an individual right of suffrage. Those should be charged with that duty who in the opinion of the majority can discharge it with most advantage to the public.

Hitherto in most States and countries that duty has been imposed only on men. It is improbable that in any State of this Union, at any rate—unless for special reasons in some of the Southern States—the men voters would refuse the suffrage to women when requested by a majority of that sex.

The only question that has ever arisen is whether women shall be subjected to that duty upon request of what seemed to be a minority of women.

In this State, and some others, this question has been answered in the affirmative. There was strong advocacy on the part of some women and no serious opposition on the part of any. The male voters, therefore, had the right to and did assume that women desired or did not object to the duty and, therefore, imposed it by a large majority.

There is no opposition on the part of women to this day. It is within their power by initiative petition to at any time ask the people to submit the question to a vote of the women only, with the moral certainty that the petition would be granted if it apparently represented the desire of the majority of women. As no such effort has been made the public has a right to assume that women have got what they want. That is what the men desire that they shall have.

But results show that in this State women refuse to accept the obligation which at their request or upon their apparent acquiescence has been imposed upon them or to discharge the resulting duties.

The question, then, for the people of other States to decide, in the light of the experience of the Western States, is whether it is in the public interest to impose on women imperative duties which the great majority of women refuse to discharge after they have been imposed upon them.

Or, at least, whether they shall put such obligations upon women unless the women by an affirmative majority vote express their willingness to accept the obligation.

No intelligent man claims that women are less competent than men to vote. Very few men object to women voting, if they will do it.

And neither will any wise person assert that it is for the public interest to have in the electorate great masses of electors who refuse to vote.

The danger of hysterical crusades of ill-informed women for the righting of wrongs which they half understand, and the helping of sufferers whose lot their well meant efforts may only make harder is a very real one. Social workers can diminish the danger by supplying a clear, unvarnished record of their methods and activities, their successes and their failures.—*London Times*, Nov. 26, 1914.

SUFFRAGE IN THE PRESIDENT'S STATE

WASHINGTON, Jan. 14.—White House officials took pains this afternoon to make it clear that President Wilson had said nothing to a delegation of suffragettes earlier in the day which could possibly be construed as a commitment of himself to the equal franchise legislation which soon is to be voted upon in the New Jersey Legislature.

The delegation, which was headed by Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, urged the President to issue a statement favoring suffrage in his own State. After the interview Dr. Shaw said that the women had left the White House with the distinct impression that the President would issue such a statement soon.

White House officials declared the President had scrupulously refrained from expressing any views on the issue in New Jersey.

The following letter to President Wilson is interesting in this connection:

MY DEAR MR. WILSON:

In view of the agitation in the State of New Jersey it seems proper that some exposition be given one so high in authority as yourself of the real conditions in your own State of the opposition to woman suffrage.

It is less than three years since the encroachments of the Suffragists alarmed the conservative women of this State, and an association was speedily formed, though with much reluctance, since these women, because of their very position on this subject, were loath to enter the arena of political struggle.

Since 1912 there have been enrolled in our Association 11,500 women over twenty-one years of age, residents of New Jersey, who protest that it is not just to force the burdens of the franchise upon so large an unwilling electorate. They feel that it is not equal—*i. e.*, identical—suffrage that is being demanded, but suffrage for a privileged class of voters, who do not intend to assume the obligations of the position in State responsibilities for which they clamor. This statement can be substantiated by countless quotations from the sayings and publications of Suffragists.

It is threatened that an attempt will be made to run woman suffrage through some of the legislatures of the Eastern States by the same methods used to impose it upon the women of Illinois. We submit that a so-called reform, supported by those who are professedly seeking the betterment of political conditions, should not need to be forced through our legislative bodies by any methods of political chicanery.

In New Jersey we have branch associations in 26 towns. The State officers are women affilated through the male members of their families with each of the large political parties—such women as Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr., Mrs. Garret A. Hobart, Mrs. John R. Emery, Miss Anna Dayton, Mrs. William S. Stryker, Miss Henrietta O. Magie, Mrs. Thomas J. Craven, Miss Anne McIlvaine, Mrs. Wallace M. Scudder, Mrs. Allan McDermott, Mrs. William Libbey, Mrs. Karl G. Roebling, and many others well known in their home State in connection with large charitable, benevolent and educational movements.

It would seem that due consideration should be paid to the convictions of women of such character and influence, and to our large membership of earnest women—a large proportion of whom are wage-earners—who honestly believe that political equality will not be for the good of the State or for the elevation of the individual.

Hoping that this condensed report of the activities of our organization may interest you, and thanking you for the courtesy of your attention, I am

Yours very respectfully,
MARY SCUDDER JAMIESON,
President New Jersey Association
Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

LAWRENCEVILLE, N. J., January 22, 1915.

In connection with Alberta Hill's statement that President Wilson was favorable to woman suffrage and said so in a speech in New Jersey before he was elected President, what he did say was in a speech made to the Democratic Women's League which was composed of both suffragists and anti-suffragists, about equally, "I consider this an arguable question and am still considering the arguments."

(From the January English *Anti-Suffrage Review*)

Mrs. Pethick Lawrence fervently desires immunity from the terrible duty of organized murder. Millions of her fellow-women are equally desirous of retaining their immunity from another terrible duty—political war. They hold that this immunity, too, is a great boon to women and the whole world, and they note that it is placed in jeopardy by Mrs. Pethick Lawrence and others, who wish women to be thrust willy-nilly upon political battlefields, virtually unarmed, because they lack the physical advantages of the other combatants.

Legislators for Submission but Against Suffrage

IT has been a most interesting and encouraging sign of the drift of current opinion to note that in many legislatures where the question of the submission of a Constitutional amendment was under consideration, many men who went on record in favor of the submission of the amendment officially announced that they would vote against woman suffrage when it came to the people at the polls. Some of these men even have announced that they will not only vote, but work against the amendment which would give suffrage to the women of their State.

And yet we find the official suffrage organ, *The Woman Voter*, proclaiming in big type as BELIEVERS IN WOMAN SUFFRAGE those legislators who have merely voted for the submission of the question to the people.

Suffragists have a habit of turning everybody and everything into an advocate for suffrage. They even quote party platforms as pledging the party to suffrage when the declaration is "We advise that it be submitted to the people." And it is usually submitted without recommendation.

Ananias should look to his laurels.

Congressman Burke, of South Dakota, voted against the woman suffrage amendment in his State at the election last November because his wife and daughter asked him to. There is little doubt that the votes of thousands of intelligent men against woman suffrage can be explained in the same way.

"Don't Ask Too Much of Man's Intelligence"

The press of Sunday, January 24th, carried an interview with Miss Henrietta Rodman, a well-known feminist. The closing paragraph as printed in the Boston *Herald* of that date is an interesting piece of evidence of the alliance between suffrage and feminism; an alliance not admitted by the leaders of the suffrage movement, but acknowledged by those who, having started on the career of the feminist, do not evade the social issues which must arise with this far-reaching political change. Miss Rodman is reported to have put the case thus: "Feminism and suffrage? Every feminist, of course, is a Suffragist, but only a small proportion of the Suffragists are feminists. The tendency, however, is that way. It is largely a tactical matter with the Suffragists. They regard it as a mistake to ask too much at once of man's intelligence."

Where Suffrage Agitators Are Campaigning

The woman suffrage amendment will be voted on in West Virginia in 1916. The amendment had to pass only one legislature in that State and passed both Houses on January 26th.

In Texas the woman suffrage amendment has been presented in both Houses.

In the Alabama House of Representatives a bill was introduced on January 20th to amend the State Constitution, giving the franchise to women.

In Delaware a bill has been introduced in the Lower House, granting the ballot to women, but no action has been taken.

In New York State the Suffrage Bill has been introduced in both Houses for the required second passage, in spite of the efforts of the Suffragists, who sought to have the matter shifted to the Constitutional Convention.

A resolve proposing an amendment to the constitution to give political rights to the women of Maine on equal terms with men was introduced in the Legislature of that State on January 20th by Representative Loren M. Sanborn, of South Portland.

A bill submitting woman suffrage to the voters of Tennessee has recently passed both houses of the legislature. It must pass another legislature and, if passed, will then be submitted to the voters of the State.

The suffrage bill was passed by the House of the New Jersey legislature by a unanimous vote that the proposed amendment extending the franchise to women be submitted to the voters in September.

A Warning to Magazines

(From the *Fourth Estate.*)

RICHARD H. WALDO, assistant general manager of the New York *Tribune,* told an audience at the Fifth Avenue Suffrage Shop (in December) that no publication which depended on the subscriptions of women could feature woman suffrage and live. He found this out, he said, when, during his connection with *Good Housekeeping,* that magazine attempted to print a serial biography of Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst.

"The letters of protest which piled in upon us forced us to discontinue it," he said.

WHY 12,000 ORGANIZE AGAINST SUFFRAGE

The following statement by Mrs. John R. Emery, of Morristown, N. J., is issued by The New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, composed of 12,000 women of over twenty-one years of age. It ably expresses their views on the question of "Votes for Women," and was declared by Congressman Tuttle "to be the strongest argument that he had received on either side of the question:"

(*From Newark Evening News.*)

"WE claim that the votes of women have not succeeded in bettering or controlling industrial conditions in Colorado, nor have they succeeded in California in introducing valuable economic reforms, as the 'high cost of living' there has been increased rather than diminished, by a higher rate of taxes since the vote for women has existed there; that, also, the proud claim that woman would 'purify politics' cannot be unquestioned as long as the leaders of the Women's Congressional Union continue to threaten the President and other Government officials with political destruction, through their power at the next election, unless they would pronounce themselves in favor of woman suffrage. Such a 'black list' was indeed published during the current year, and would seem to prove that politically there is not much difference between the man political boss and his feminine emulator.

"In the Newark *Sunday Call* of this day I read the following sentence apropos of the approaching debate: 'The committee this year is an active committee rather than in times past a semi-honorary one. It is made up of women who are giving practically their entire time to the task,' etc., etc.

"This is indeed true and would certainly fairly raise the question as to what becomes of any other than political duties under such stress. It must indeed be only the exceptional woman who can have the ability, strength and energy for such duties and still retain her poise as home-maker and home-keeper.

"For years our great neurologists have been telling us of the danger to our race through the nervousness of the American woman. Sanitariums and rest cures have been built and filled by hundreds of nervous cases—and yet the American women of today are urging upon their sisters the additional nerve burden of men's duties as well as women's.

"We consider also that a great blot rests on the woman suffrage movement, in that they have not sufficiently repudiated the doctrines of the feminists who have allied themselves with them, especially in their teachings on marriage and divorce, and their complete destruction of the idea of home centralization as a means of power and self-control; in that they have, in the same way allowed themselves to be used by the Socialist party, for the advancement of their radical doctrines, having countenanced their organization by carrying their banners in their parades on more than one occasion.

"We also deplore their reception and entertainment of such agitators as Mrs. Pankhurst, Miss Christabel Pankhurst and Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, and we think this should certainly make the men and women of America stop to question the state of mind which makes this possible to women of honor and truth. If these are to be their political ideals—is it worth while to introduce them in America?

"All these considerations lead us to believe that politically as well as ethically the equal suffrage will not benefit either our country, our women or our race.

"And lastly, we contend that never in the history of politics has any party made such large, and varied, and overwhelming promises to gain votes as has the National Association for Equal Suffrage and the Woman's Congressional Union, and it will take them until the millennium to make good their promises, and therefore their futility is apparent and that until this association can control its own members on these and kindred points, it has not the vital force to entitle it to change our established Constitution by any such disturbing amendment as that proposed, especially at a time in the world's history when we need all the stability and responsibility of our form of government, to meet and stay the upheaval of world powers now trembling in the balance.

"If ever our country is to prove the superiority of her faith—her government—and her ideals—now is the appointed time, and it is not for her women—the cradle of her race—to tear down her safeguards, but rather is it their duty to conserve and strengthen her in quietness and confidence."

The editorial comment in the Syracuse (N. Y.) *Herald* of January 17th is interesting.

"The circumstances attending the late struggle in the House of Representatives are a pretty sharp reminder that women Anti-Suffragists are a force to be reckoned with. So far as their organization goes, they are not nearly so powerful as the Suffragists, but we believe that they represent a considerable majority of the women of the North, South and Middle West. In our judgment, this feminine opposition, partly active and to a far larger extent passive, is the most serious obstacle the advocates of political equality between the sexes have to confront."

Why Will it be Impossible for English to Say "No"?

(*Special to The Washington Post.*)

NEW YORK, Oct. 20.—"It will be impossible for Englishmen to say 'no' to us after this war is over. I fully expect that they will give us the vote immediately."

Christabel Pankhurst, archmilitant and leader of English women who consider the vote as necessary enough to fight for, made this statement today.

"Has this war stolen our thunder?" Miss Pankhurst repeated the question. "Not a bit of it," she replied with firmness; "not one bit. After all, civil war has a seriousness all its own, and that was what we were fighting.

"If we are driven to renew our militant tactics they will be more effectual after this war than ever before. Really, though, I'm not expecting that, especially if in November the men of your seven campaign States in this country decide that women shall vote. I'm eager to take back to Mr. Asquith a map of the United States with seventeen States and Alaska painted white for equal suffrage. I want to show him the progress you made."

Christabel Pankhurst has been disappointed in one hope. She will not take back a map with seventeen States branded "woman suffrage."

She thinks it will be "impossible for Englishmen to say 'no' to us after the war is over." To others it would appear that it would be impossible for women to ask for anything. However, Miss Pankhurst evidently belongs to the type of woman who believes that chivalry requires that men should gladly and willingly sacrifice their lives for women who do not even say thank you. She thinks the deaths of hundreds of thousands of men in the trenches makes it impossible to say "no" to women. And why, we may ask, since Miss Pankhurst is campaigning for man's gratitude doesn't she stay on the scene of action and do something to deserve it? This question will most likely not be answered by the "archmilitant" who preferred to remain in Paris during all the period of militant arrests. Miss Pankhurst's militancy is very theoretical.

Another English suffrage leader, Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, has recently been in America collecting funds. Although she has renounced the ultra militants, it was her money which kept up the so-called civil war until a short time ago. Now she declares that she does not believe in militarism or militancy.

How Suffragettes Advertise Their Patriotic Endeavor

THE Woman's Emergency Corps, an English organization for relief work, has been the cause of considerable controversy in English papers. The English *Anti-Suffrage Review* says:

"Where the Corps seems to have gone astray is in seeking to arrange that notoriety and doing good should advance hand in hand. Its first care, if report is to be believed, was to secure publicity, and while in every other department it was content with amateur help, in that sphere alone was professional assistance engaged. When, in addition, a press committee is appointed with an energetic president, there can be only one result. Thus almost as soon as the first woman has made the first toy, the public is asked to gaze with open-mouthed interest on the prospect of Germany's toy industry being captured; one or two workrooms become 'hives of industry,' a few meals are given away, and 'hundreds of poor people' are represented as being fed daily. The Women's Emergency Corps started with a sound scheme, and, as already stated, has much to its credit. But it has become suspect on two grounds; first, its methods of advertisement accord ill with patriotic eneavor of any kind; secondly, in spite of the original claim made by Miss Lena Ashwell that the movement was 'non-party, non-political, non-everything except that it aimed to remove every barrier that lay between them and the great call to serve their country,' it has been claimed by the Suffragists as entirely their own."

Why "Antis" are First to Register Where Women Vote

IT appears strange to the Montana press that the first Butte woman to be registered as a duly qualified voter in Silver Bow county under the constitutional amendment recently adopted is Mrs. W. J. Christie, who was one of the most active of the Anti-Suffragists during the long campaign prior to the election last November. She was accompanied to the registry office in the courthouse by Mrs. David Dickson, also an Anti. The third lady to register was Mrs. Kate Dennis, president of the Butte Equal Suffrage Associaion. Mrs. Moore, President of the State Anti-Suffrage Association, was also among the early registrants.

The Anti-Suffragists register and vote when the responsibility of the ballot has been forced upon them because they regard the vote as a duty and not a "right."

Leading Suffragists state that the vote is a right and that voting is optional with the individual.

Leading statesmen, however, are convinced that the "stay-at-home vote" is an increasing menace to republican government and are seriously considering legislation to make voting compulsory. A smaller proportion of the electorate votes in woman-suffrage States than in man-suffrage States. Woman suffrage increases the indifferent vote, the menacing "stay-at-home vote."

An attack on what he termed the ludicrous effrontery of the Suffragists in glorifying militancy in 1913 and posing as a peace party in 1915, featured the second of Dr. Ernest Bernbaum's lectures on "Anti-Suffrage," at the Public Interests League rooms in Boston recently.

A STORY WITH A MORAL

MISS MINNIE BRONSON tells the following amusing story in connection with a debate she had last summer out in Wisconsin with a lady Suffragist, who in the course of the debate as she tried to show what a useless sex the male sex was, told a story to make her point. She said: "I have a little farm. I have some chickens on that farm and one day I heard a terrible noise out in the chicken yard and went out to find out what was the trouble, and I saw the old hen calling her little chickens under her wings to protect them from what threatened, and I looked about on the ground to see what it was and there was nothing in sight, and then I turned my eyes up into the sky and I saw a great black hawk flying around and around and around with the evident intention of dropping down to that chicken yard and picking up one of those little chickens; and what do you suppose that old rooster was doing? Why, he was standing up on the fence and crowing just as loud as he could." Well, how that audience laughed! When it came time for Miss Bronson to speak she said that she had been particularly impressed, but could not help thinking what would have happened to those chickens if the old hen had gotten up on the fence and insisted on fluttering her wings. If that rooster had tried to do the work of the hen and the hen had gotten up on the fence the hawk would have gotten the chickens, but the rooster did what he was created to do and so did she.

NOTES AND COMMENT

Some time ago the Women's Democratic Club of the Second Ward in Chicago, Ill., advertised for an aldermanic candidate. It was announced that to receive the endorsement of the club, the successful applicant would have to be:

A clean, respectable citizen. A possessor of horse sense, not necessarily a college graduate. A friend of woman suffrage. An advocate of subways, a voter for bathing beaches and playgrounds. A leader, not a follower. A man of constructive ability.

Six replies were received. The applicants were a machinst, a broker, a clergyman, a manufacturer, a physician and a saloonkeeper. The saloonkeeper won.

Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, Suffragist leader, is advocating the formation of a union of the school teachers of New York in order to coerce the Board of Education into granting the demands of certain leaders. She proposes that they utilize the strike as a weapon to obtain their demands.

A Public Interests' Committee has been formed recently in Philadelphia by the Pennsylvania Association opposed to Woman Suffrage along lines originated by the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association, to take up relief work, and moral and educational enterprises in addition to the campaign against votes. The Massachusetts Association, with such a Committee, established a Red Cross Station and sewing circles, etc., very much similar to work done in Philadelphia by the Emergency Aid Committee, in which local suffragists and "antis" got together under the motto: "Stand behind your cause, instead of in front of it." Miss Florence R. Hall, of Bryn Mawr, is chairman of the Public Interests' Committee, with Mrs. Simeon H. Guilford and Mrs. George P. White as assistants.

Although there were many Anti-Suffragists at the debate in the House of Representatives on the Federal Woman Suffrage amendment, most of them represented the District Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage. The National Association was represented by only twelve official delegates, the number being purposely limited by the board of directors because of a reluctance to ask women, occupied with home duties and relief work, to spend time and energy uselessly.

There was a noticeable lack of any demonstration from the galleries where the Anti-Suffragists sat, a condition in conformance with the rules of the House. There was neither applause nor hissing from this gallery.

The annual meeting and election of the Hamilton County Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage was held on January 11th at the Hotel Gibson, Cincinnati, Ohio. Mrs. Lawrence Maxwell was elected President to succeed in office Mrs. Austin Goodman.

Other officers elected were: Mrs. Longworth, Sr., Honorary President; Vice-Presidents, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman, Mrs. David Workum, Mrs. W. C. Clippinger, Mrs. Henry C. Yergason, Mrs. Charles H. Kellogg, Mrs. D. B. Meacham, Mrs. Mortimer Matthews, Mrs. H. Langdon Laws and Mrs. Pauline Esselborn; for Treasurer, Mrs. Frank D. Jamison, and Secretary, Mrs. Louis T. More.

The anti-suffrage side received a unanimous vote of the judges in a debate held on January 12th, in Dover, N. J. The subject was:

"Resolved, That women should be given the same political rights as men."

The plan of debate was practically as follows:

1. That woman was not made to rule politically.

2. That no exigency has arisen to demand an abnormal remedy.

3. That no marked improvement has been made in those States where woman suffrage has been adopted.

4. That woman was not constitutionally constructed for a political career; that her energies are now fully occupied; and that to burden her further would be an economic and eugenic disaster.

A New England conference of the principal officers of the Anti-Suffrage Associations of the five New England States was held Friday, January 22d, at the residence of Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, 130 Beacon st., Boston, Mass. The conference was called at this time for the purpose of agreeing on a comprehensive plan of campaign for all the New England States and for the general exchange of reports on progress. Inasmuch as the Legislatures this year are meeting in nearly all the New England States, it is regarded as important that a uniform programme be agreed on.

One of the most interesting reports was that relating to the general relief work which has been done in the various States. In addition, there were reports on the improvements in humanitarian legislation which have been enacted.

Among those who have registered for attendance at the conference are: Mrs. Daniel A. Markham and Mrs. William T. Howe, of Connecticut; Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Mrs. Clarence Hale, and Mrs. George S. Hobbs, of Maine; Mrs. A. T. Dudley and Miss Grace Morrill, of New Hampshire; Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard and Mrs. Ernest Howe and Mrs. A. G. Harkness, of Rhode Island; Mrs. Clarence Morgan, of Vermont, and a large delegation from the Massachusetts Association.

AMONG all the arguments connected with the extension of the franchise to women, one point seems to have been overlooked.

We have yet to prove as a government the stability of our adherence to accepted political platforms. The republican form of rule is not so well established that we can run many risks trifling with it. During the last fifty years there have been numerous splits from party lines, the latest one being the Progressive Party. The ideals and reforms offered each time have appealed strongly to masses of voters one year, only to be discarded the following year as impractical or theoretical. True, the men rectify the mistake, but they cannot recall the election, and the country suffers serious financial as well as political upheaval.

This has happened under the man-made government, under the vote of men trained to political responsibilities. Election returns from 1912 and 1914 show that the last attack was the worst yet. We do not learn.

We are a nation of idealists, impetuous, strong for afterthought. We are very prone to ride our personal hobby-horses before the voters from June until November. Then, if we suffer defeat, we hustle around to discover another man of strong personality and land his individual ideal. If we have success we regret for a term of years the fanatical government we have imposed upon ourselves.

These are the conditions with approximately 28,000,000 voters. Let us learn self-control and unity before we double the national vote.

GERTRUDE C. TUCKER.

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Complete set, 50 cts. Single copies, 5 cts.

Selected packages, 25 cts.

PAMPHLETS

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Should We Ask for the Suffrage? *Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer*
Woman's Relation to Government *Mrs. Wm. F. Scott*
New Zealand and Australia, etc.
The Blank Cartridge Ballot *Rossiter Johnson*
Address (Made before Constitutional Convention, 1894) *Hon. Elihu Root*
Taxation and Suffrage *Frederick Dwight*
Woman and the Law *Francis M. Scott*
First Legislative Address *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
Woman Suffrage *Carl Schurz*
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy, etc.
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law
Dodgers

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Militant and the Child *Mrs. F. M. Scott*
Woman's Rights *vs.* Woman Suffrage *Mrs. A. J. George*
Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement, etc. *John R. Dos Passos*
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation *Minnie Bronson*
Wage-Earning Woman and the State *Minnie Bronson*
The Relation of the Sexes to Government *Prof. Edward Cope*
A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question *Miss Emily P. Bissell*
Should Women Vote? *Joseph Gilpin Pyle*
An Open Letter to Clergymen
Dodgers—Statistics
Silk Pins.....10c. each Ribbon.....10c. and 15c. a yard
Celluloid Buttons.....5c. Pennants.....15c. and 25c.

NEW YORK STATE MEN'S ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO POLITICAL SUFFRAGE FOR WOMEN

27 William Street Room 1823 New York City

Brief before Rules Committee, Washington, D. C., Dec. 4, 1913 *Everett P. Wheeler*
Questionaire
Women and The Vote *Everett P. Wheeler*
Feminist Principle Biologically Unsound *Prof. William I. Sedgwick*

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

Woman Adrift ($1.50) *Harold Owen*
The Nature of Woman ($1.25) *J. Lionel Tayler*
Vocation of Woman ($1.50) *Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun*
The Business of Being a Woman ($1.50) *Ida Tarbell*
The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage ($1.00) *Sir Almroth Wright*
The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)
The Unrest of Women ($1.00) *E. S. Martin*
Votes for Men (50c.)
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

These can be obtained by applying to

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

We recommend to our readers THE LIVE ISSUE, published weekly. Subscription, 50c. Office, 345 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. Also, THE REMONSTRANCE; subscription, 25c.; 687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women:

Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage *Francis Parkman*
Argument before U. S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage *Mrs. A. J. George*
Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? *Frank Foxcroft*
Taxpaying Suffrage *Charles R. Saunders*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and not to Men
Opinions of Eminent Persons Against Woman Suffrage
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage *Ida M. Tarbell*
Woman Suffrage in Practice—An Answer to George Creel
Address in Opposition to Woman Suffrage *Mrs. George A. Caswell*

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association, KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street BOSTON, MASS.

Selected Packages, 25c.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

.....1915

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....year's subscription

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State .....

Subscription Rate, $1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....